

ATTACHMENT 5 (October 20, 2000)

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS (PEP)

White Paper Solicitation and Distribution

The Government shall solicit proposals (“White Papers”) for MAI relevant technical work (“Projects”) on behalf of the Consortium via announcement in the Commerce Business Daily (“CBD”). The CBD announcement will include the customary requirements for proposal submittals, as well as the objective criteria and Government’s procedures for becoming a Consortium Member. All White Papers received in response to the solicitation will be submitted to the MAI Program Office which, in turn (and, if the offeror is not currently a member of the Consortium, after notification by the Air Force that the offeror has been admitted as a new Consortium Member under the relevant objective criteria and after signing the Metals Affordability Consortium’s Collaboration Agreement), will forward copies to each member of the Technical Oversight Committee (“TOC”) at least three (3) weeks prior to the collective TOC evaluation discussed below.

Evaluation Criteria

White Papers will be evaluated and scored against the following criteria with relative value denoted by the specified weighting factor:

Evaluation Criterion Number 1: Technical Merit, Military Benefit and Commercial Viability (weight: 0.9): The proposed Project must focus on pervasive industry airframe, engine, and space vehicle enterprises such as product design, metals and manufacturing processes, raw materials extraction, and business practices that will impact product affordability. The proposed Project must demonstrate lower cost, reduced time to market and/or less risk and result in a pervasive impact on the affordability and performance of current and/or future military airframe, engine, and space vehicles with a clear transition path to commercial application. Therefore, for this criterion, evaluation of White Papers will be made using the objectives of the Core Metals Affordability Initiative technical strategy as metrics (listed below) with the following weights for each metric:

Business Case Development (0.20)

Schedule / Time Impacts (0.15)

Performance Impact (0.15)

Pervasiveness (0.15)

Technical Viability / Risk (0.10)

Implementation (Technology Transition) Plan (0.15)

Evaluation Criterion Number 2: Quality and Amount of Cost Share (weight: 0.10): These are the financial resources that will be contributed by the offerors on the proposed effort and will be subject to the direction of the AIPT team. Thus, funds that the non-federal participants will spend for man-hours, materials, new equipment (prorated as

appropriate), subcontractors efforts expended on the Project's SOW, and the restocking of the parts and materials consumed, qualify as cost share (when not proposed for Government reimbursement / payment). Cost share can include new IR&D effort, but only if those funds are to be spent on the SOW and are subject to the direction of the Project management team. The percentage of industry cost share must meet or exceed 25% of the total project cost.

Individual White Paper Evaluation and Scoring by TOC Members:

Upon receipt of copies of White Papers submitted, each TOC member will individually evaluate each White Paper, per the criteria stated above prior to the TOC meeting at which the collective evaluation and scoring will take place.

Preliminary Scoring – Each TOC member will record his/her preliminary score on a scoring sheet. This sheet will be brought to the meeting by the TOC member or designee to expedite scoring. TOC members may not discuss their preliminary scores with other TOC members or offerors. If the TOC member or designee cannot make the meeting or participate via teleconference or similar method, the scoring sheet shall be signed, notarized, and sent to the Air Force one week prior to the meeting.

Discussion and Collective Evaluation by TOC Members

After each White Paper has been read and preliminarily scored by the individual TOC members, the TOC will meet to discuss and evaluate, in turn, each White Paper submitted. The discussion and evaluation process will be facilitated by the TOC co-chairmen who will also randomly select the first White Paper to be discussed. The discussion on that White Paper will be led by a TOC member other than a TOC member from the submitter or a team member of the submitter of the White Paper being discussed. The purpose of the discussion will be to assist the TOC members in understanding the proposed Project. This procedure is specifically intended to avoid such discussions from becoming advocacy sessions whereby TOC members act as advocates for their own company's respective White Papers and/or against others.

After the White Paper has been discussed, the Air Force TOC member will enter the preliminary scores for any absent TOC members. A minimum of two-thirds (2/3) of the TOC members must score each White Paper for the selection to be valid. EXPERT CHOICE™ software, supplied and facilitated by the Air Force, shall be used during this scoring portion of the evaluation process. The scores for the respective evaluation criteria will be concealed during the collective scoring process, as enabled by the EXPERT CHOICE™ software. After the score on an individual criterion for a given White Paper is complete, all scores for that criterion will be shown and additional discussion will take place for the purpose of revealing and understanding all scores that fall 1.5 standard deviations above or below the mean. This scoring and discussion process is designed in the EXPERT CHOICE™ software as a direct means to resolve immediately any indications of bias, conflict of interest or concerns with legitimate technical merit. TOC

members present will have the opportunity to change their scores on a criteria after such additional discussion. The scores of absent TOC members shall not change. Scoring will then proceed to the next criterion. After all criteria have been discussed and scored for a given White Paper, the Air Force TOC member will randomly select the next White Paper to be discussed and scored, and discussions and scoring for each White paper in turn will proceed as set forth above for the first White Paper. All discussions and scoring on a particular White Paper must be completed before discussions and scoring may begin on the next White Paper.

Compilation of White Paper Scores

In computing overall scores on the White Papers, the EXPERT CHOICE™ software will compare the scores of each TOC member on each White Paper with the mean score of all TOC members on that White Paper, and all scores of a TOC member on the White Paper shall be discarded if: a) The member's company is participating in the Project proposed in the White Paper and the member's score for the White Paper is 1.5 standard deviations above the mean; or b) A competitor is participating and the TOC member's company is not participating in the project proposed in the White Paper, and the member's score for the White Paper is 1.5 standard deviations below the mean. The scoring member, however, shall have the opportunity to defend the technical merit and rational of his/her score. The TOC, by 2/3 majority vote can allow the score to stand as cast. Otherwise the vote will be discarded. Once scores have been discarded under this procedure, the EXPERT CHOICE™ software will re-compute the mean score for the affected White Paper. After all White Papers have been scored, the TOC will review all scoring results and funding profiles. Based on the ranked scores, the TOC will then decide which programs to recommend for funding to the ESC.

Clarifications & Presentations

If a White Paper receives a high score but is not recommended for funding to the ESC, the TOC may request clarification from the offeror. Reasons for requesting clarification may include: 1) Clarifications that the Project is needed; 2) There is considerable overlap between two or more different proposed Projects, so combining them is desirable; 3) There is insufficient funding for the entire proposed Project, but portions of it can be funded; 4) There is concern that proposed facilities are inadequate. The MAI Program Integrator (PI) will assign a TOC member to provide a written request to the applicable offeror for clarification to be provided within three weeks. The clarified Project will then be re-evaluated and re-scored at the next TOC meeting with a final recommendation made. If the requested clarification is not received, the White Paper will then be considered unresponsive.

Recommendations to ESC

The PI will assign a TOC member to prepare an executive summary and recommendation package for the ESC. The PI will present this to the ESC at the earliest

possible opportunity to obtain approval for funding. The ESC shall render its decision to the PI concerning those programs or portions of programs approved for funding.

The PI shall submit to the MAI Program Business Integrator (PBI) those White Papers approved by the ESC for funding. It will be the responsibility of the PBI to ensure that White Papers being considered by the ESC are within available funding.

Notice of Awards

The PI shall notify the offeror, in writing, the decision of MAI ESC to fund, in whole or in part, the specific Project(s) proposed. This shall be done within thirty days after receipt of the ESC's decision. White Papers not selected for funding for reasons of insufficient available funds shall, with the concurrence of the offeror, be retained for future funding consideration. Such Papers may be modified at the discretion of the offeror and resubmitted either at the TOC's request or during the next Call for White Papers cycle.